

SILVER AND LEAD

Silver, 60¢ per ounce.
Copper, 15¢ per pound.
Lead, A. S. & R. Co.'s price, \$3.87 1/2; New
York exchange, \$3.97 1/2 @ 4.02 1/2; New York
brokers', \$3.90.

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

JUDGE HILES GRANTS
CRIST OF DIVORCES

Twenty-seven Unhappy Couples Are Given Legal Separations.

Tales of Woe Were Interesting, Amusing and Pathetic—Several Cases Were Turned Over to Referees.

The divorce matinee, held by Judge Hiles yesterday broke the record in point of the number of marital dissolutions granted. Out of thirty-two cases on the calendar twenty-seven divorces were allowed, two were referred, two were continued and one was dismissed. Of the twenty-seven granted twenty-three were on the petition of the wife and six on that of the husband. There was a large crowd of spectators, principals and witnesses in the court room at the opening of the session of court, but long before noon the interest lagged and the audience began to thin out. This was, of course, due to two reasons, that those present had been granted what they sought, and the uninteresting sameness of the testimony which after a dozen or so cases had been heard, became very monotonous.

Following is a list of the cases on which a decree was granted:

Daisy D. Schaffer vs. William J. Schaffer.

Clarissa E. Symmes vs. George R. Symmes.

Simeon R. Scott vs. Maud E. Scott.

Mary L. McLeod vs. Norman W. McLeod.

Louise M. Crismon vs. Sidney C. Crismon.

Elizabeth Smith vs. Hugh W. Smith.

Ada De Sercourt vs. William A. De Sercourt.

Amy Burnham vs. Edward T. Burnham.

Emily Henrietta Fuller vs. James William Fuller.

Mary A. Solis vs. Joseph Solis.

Annie Rillston vs. Edwin Rillston.

Bertha Cizick vs. Jay Cizick.

John Heil, Jr. vs. Hattie Heil.

Thella Braun vs. Peter R. Braun.

Matilda Fagenberg vs. Adolph Fagenberg.

Vilate W. G. Taylor vs. William A. Taylor.

Charles C. Anderson vs. Barbara Anderson.

Margie M. Mitchell vs. Edward J. Mitchell.

Josephine Alcock vs. Samuel Alcock.

Neal J. Anderson vs. Nettie J. Anderson.

Mary Wiseman vs. George Wiseman.

Charles H. Trickett vs. Alice H. Trickett.

Margaret Case vs. Hymus H. Case.

Addie Hemlow vs. Walter Hemlow.

Minne A. Macy vs. Henry I. Macy.

Irene Crismon vs. Frank W. Crismon.

Edith Dennison vs. John W. Dennison.

The suit of Mary E. Jensen against Lars Jensen was referred to Clerk Blair and that of Margaret Webb against William J. Webb to Clerk Little.

Susie S. Donelson's case against her husband, Charles M. Donelson, was dismissed, and the cases, Nettie McDonald vs. Franklin McDonald and Huel M. Allred vs. Maud P. Allred, were continued for the term.

Many Reasons for Divorce.

While the reasons for divorces were necessarily largely of the same character, desertion and non-support, generally, yet there were all kinds of painful if sometimes amusing variations in the testimony. For instance, in the McLeod case the wife testified to her husband's lack of appreciation and taste in that he wrote her that if she was not satisfied with him she should sue for a divorce, and it might be better for a divorce if her next choice belonged to the husband's union.

But then the husband was a newspaper man, the wife a model, and he was addicted to the cup which cheers and inebriates. And again the case of Ada De Sercourt who testified that when she married William A. he was so tickled that he started in to celebrate. He has been having a wild and delicious time ever since. In fact, from the condition his wife says he is in, he must have been tickled half to death. Willie has been celebrating up against the bar for a matter of two years, but the end has come and now Willie and Ada are free.

In the Schaffer case the wife testified that she was married on May 26, 1898. Married bliss was, however, of short duration for her good man strayed from home on the 14th of the following August and since that time has absented himself from the bosom of his family. He had sought pastures new in the Sunflower state. The last she had heard of him he was in Topeka.

Frederick Swanson, step-father to the plaintiff, testified that his step-son-in-law had been discharged from the employ of the Rio Grande Western railroad company for mistaking himself for Tom Sharkey, probably owing to the fact that his wife's maiden name had been Sharkey. It followed that Shaffer must be an able bodied man and that settled it. Now the wife has the fighting name and her liberty. Ray Van Cott acted for the plaintiff.

In the Symmes case the plaintiff wife was allowed \$1,000 for the support of her child and half that amount in yearly alimony.

Scott's Tale of Woe.

The eyes of every woman were riveted on Simeon R. Scott when his case was called. Scott proved to be pleasant in the eyes of the other sex and his testimony was listened to with close attention. He is a young, good looking fellow of 28, and took a draw in the matrimonial bag just two years and one week today. He wishes that he had drawn a blank.

It was at first supposed to be a case of poverty coming in at the door and love chasing itself through the window, but the looks of the women in court which had grown cold warmed up when it was divulged that Scott was in

THE SALT LAKE HERALD.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, TUESDAY, MAY 22 1900

WEATHER TODAY.

Forecast for Salt Lake Today Is: Fair; Stationary Temperature.

NUMBER 353

RIOT AND DEATH
IN CAR STRIKE

Boy Killed and Girl and Two Men Wounded.

MOB OF WOMEN CHASES
THREE OF THEIR SEX

Pursues Them Blocks in Streets and Vacant Lots.

Several Outbreaks Occur in Various Localities—Stones Are Hurling by the Crowd, and Shots Are Fired in Fusillades—Throng Resent the Attempts to Run the Cars—Slain Youth and Injured Girl Were By-standers.

St. Louis, Mo., May 21.—One boy killed and two men and a girl were wounded today as a result of the strike.

The dead:

Martin Zika, 18 years of age, struck in the left breast by bullet fired from a street car.

The wounded:

Clarence E. Mullen, motorman, shot in upper portion of left arm. Home in Jacksonville, Ills. Wound not serious.

Minnie Krueger, 18 years old, struck in the right arm by bullet fired from a street car.

The following is a list of the cases on which a decree was granted:

Daisy D. Schaffer vs. William J. Schaffer.

Clarissa E. Symmes vs. George R. Symmes.

Simeon R. Scott vs. Maud E. Scott.

Mary L. McLeod vs. Norman W. McLeod.

Louise M. Crismon vs. Sidney C. Crismon.

Elizabeth Smith vs. Hugh W. Smith.

Ada De Sercourt vs. William A. De Sercourt.

Amy Burnham vs. Edward T. Burnham.

Emily Henrietta Fuller vs. James William Fuller.

Mary A. Solis vs. Joseph Solis.

Annie Rillston vs. Edwin Rillston.

Bertha Cizick vs. Jay Cizick.

John Heil, Jr. vs. Hattie Heil.

Thella Braun vs. Peter R. Braun.

Matilda Fagenberg vs. Adolph Fagenberg.

Vilate W. G. Taylor vs. William A. Taylor.

Charles C. Anderson vs. Barbara Anderson.

Margie M. Mitchell vs. Edward J. Mitchell.

Josephine Alcock vs. Samuel Alcock.

Neal J. Anderson vs. Nettie J. Anderson.

Mary Wiseman vs. George Wiseman.

Charles H. Trickett vs. Alice H. Trickett.

Margaret Case vs. Hymus H. Case.

Addie Hemlow vs. Walter Hemlow.

Minne A. Macy vs. Henry I. Macy.

Irene Crismon vs. Frank W. Crismon.

Edith Dennison vs. John W. Dennison.

The suit of Mary E. Jensen against Lars Jensen was referred to Clerk Blair and that of Margaret Webb against William J. Webb to Clerk Little.

Susie S. Donelson's case against her husband, Charles M. Donelson, was dismissed, and the cases, Nettie McDonald vs. Franklin McDonald and Huel M. Allred vs. Maud P. Allred, were continued for the term.

Many Reasons for Divorce.

While the reasons for divorces were necessarily largely of the same character, desertion and non-support, generally, yet there were all kinds of painful if sometimes amusing variations in the testimony. For instance, in the McLeod case the wife testified to her husband's lack of appreciation and taste in that he wrote her that if she was not satisfied with him she should sue for a divorce, and it might be better for a divorce if her next choice belonged to the husband's union.

But then the husband was a newspaper man, the wife a model, and he was addicted to the cup which cheers and inebriates. And again the case of Ada De Sercourt who testified that when she married William A. he was so tickled that he started in to celebrate. He has been having a wild and delicious time ever since. In fact, from the condition his wife says he is in, he must have been tickled half to death. Willie has been celebrating up against the bar for a matter of two years, but the end has come and now Willie and Ada are free.

In the Schaffer case the wife testified that she was married on May 26, 1898. Married bliss was, however, of short duration for her good man strayed from home on the 14th of the following August and since that time has absented himself from the bosom of his family. He had sought pastures new in the Sunflower state. The last she had heard of him he was in Topeka.

Frederick Swanson, step-father to the plaintiff, testified that his step-son-in-law had been discharged from the employ of the Rio Grande Western railroad company for mistaking himself for Tom Sharkey, probably owing to the fact that his wife's maiden name had been Sharkey. It followed that Shaffer must be an able bodied man and that settled it. Now the wife has the fighting name and her liberty. Ray Van Cott acted for the plaintiff.

In the Symmes case the plaintiff wife was allowed \$1,000 for the support of her child and half that amount in yearly alimony.

Scott's Tale of Woe.

The eyes of every woman were riveted on Simeon R. Scott when his case was called. Scott proved to be pleasant in the eyes of the other sex and his testimony was listened to with close attention. He is a young, good looking fellow of 28, and took a draw in the matrimonial bag just two years and one week today. He wishes that he had drawn a blank.

It was at first supposed to be a case of poverty coming in at the door and love chasing itself through the window, but the looks of the women in court which had grown cold warmed up when it was divulged that Scott was in

BRITISH NEAR VAAL

Troops Are Now Approaching Johannesburg.

DISPATCHES GIVE DETAILS OF
MAKING'S RELIEF.

General Hunter Planned the Expedition and Colonel Mahon Daringly Executed It—Buller and Roberts Are Delayed—Denial Is Made That Peace Was Proposed.

London, May 22, 3:15 a. m.—British horsemen, according to a dispatch from Lourenzo Marques, are now close to the Vaal river, within forty miles of Johannesburg.

The migration from Pretoria has begun. Women and children are being sent in trains to Machadodorp on the way to Lydenburg. Trains are arriving at Lourenzo Marques filled with passengers, among whom are many Germans who are bound for Europe.

A dispatch from Lourenzo Marques under date of May 21, says the defense works of Johannesburg are progressing rapidly. Six guns brought from the front have been employed in a fort, while schanzes and trenches intersect Krugersdorp and Klipriviersburg behind the race course.

Roberts Tells of Relief.

The war office has received the following dispatch from Lord Roberts:

"Kroonstad, May 21.—Mahon (Colonel B. T. Mahon) reports having joined the race course."

The following is a list of the cases on which a decree was granted:

Daisy D. Schaffer vs. William J. Schaffer.

Clarissa E. Symmes vs. George R. Symmes.

Simeon R. Scott vs. Maud E. Scott.

Mary L. McLeod vs. Norman W. McLeod.

Louise M. Crismon vs. Sidney C. Crismon.

Elizabeth Smith vs. Hugh W. Smith.

Ada De Sercourt vs. William A. De Sercourt.

Amy Burnham vs. Edward T. Burnham.

Emily Henrietta Fuller vs. James William Fuller.

Mary A. Solis vs. Joseph Solis.

Annie Rillston vs. Edwin Rillston.

Bertha Cizick vs. Jay Cizick.

John Heil, Jr. vs. Hattie Heil.

Thella Braun vs. Peter R. Braun.

Matilda Fagenberg vs. Adolph Fagenberg.

Vilate W. G. Taylor vs. William A. Taylor.

Charles C. Anderson vs. Barbara Anderson.

Margie M. Mitchell vs. Edward J. Mitchell.

Josephine Alcock vs. Samuel Alcock.

Neal J. Anderson vs. Nettie J. Anderson.

Mary Wiseman vs. George Wiseman.

Charles H. Trickett vs. Alice H. Trickett.

Margaret Case vs. Hymus H. Case.

Addie Hemlow vs. Walter Hemlow.

Minne A. Macy vs. Henry I. Macy.

Irene Crismon vs. Frank W. Crismon.

Edith Dennison vs. John W. Dennison.

The suit of Mary E. Jensen against Lars Jensen was referred to Clerk Blair and that of Margaret Webb against William J. Webb to Clerk Little.

Susie S. Donelson's case against her husband, Charles M. Donelson, was dismissed, and the cases, Nettie McDonald vs. Franklin McDonald and Huel M. Allred vs. Maud P. Allred, were continued for the term.

Many Reasons for Divorce.

While the reasons for divorces were necessarily largely of the same character, desertion and non-support, generally, yet there were all kinds of painful if sometimes amusing variations in the testimony. For instance, in the McLeod case the wife testified to her husband's lack of appreciation and taste in that he wrote her that if she was not satisfied with him she should sue for a divorce, and it might be better for a divorce if her next choice belonged to the husband's union.

But then the husband was a newspaper man, the wife a model, and he was addicted to the cup which cheers and inebriates. And again the case of Ada De Sercourt who testified that when she married William A. he was so tickled that he started in to celebrate. He has been having a wild and delicious time ever since. In fact, from the condition his wife says he is in, he must have been tickled half to death. Willie has been celebrating up against the bar for a matter of two years, but the end has come and now Willie and Ada are free.

In the Schaffer case the wife testified that she was married on May 26, 1898. Married bliss was, however, of short duration for her good man strayed from home on the 14th of the following August and since that time has absented himself from the bosom of his family. He had sought pastures new in the Sunflower state. The last she had heard of him he was in Topeka.

Frederick Swanson, step-father to the plaintiff, testified that his step-son-in-law had been discharged from the employ of the Rio Grande Western railroad company for mistaking himself for Tom Sharkey, probably owing to the fact that his wife's maiden name had been Sharkey. It followed that Shaffer must be an able bodied man and that settled it. Now the wife has the fighting name and her liberty. Ray Van Cott acted for the plaintiff.

In the Symmes case the plaintiff wife was allowed \$1,000 for the support of her child and half that amount in yearly alimony.

Scott's Tale of Woe.

The eyes of every woman were riveted on Simeon R. Scott when his case was called. Scott proved to be pleasant in the eyes of the other sex and his testimony was listened to with close attention. He is a young, good looking fellow of 28, and took a draw in the matrimonial bag just two years and one week today. He wishes that he had drawn a blank.

It was at first supposed to be a case of poverty coming in at the door and love chasing itself through the window, but the looks of the women in court which had grown cold warmed up when it was divulged that Scott was in

DEMOCRATS WIN
KENTUCKY CASE

United States Supreme Court Ousts Taylor.

BECKHAM GOVERNOR
BEYOND DISPUTE

Decision Holds Jurisdiction Ends With State Tribunal.

Chief Justice Fuller Renders the Opinion, Holding That Office Is Not Property—Harlan, Brewer and McKenna Dissent—Joy Runs High in Frankfort—Flowers Are Heaped on Goebel's Grave—Republicans Accept Situation and Abdicade.

Washington, May 21.—The United States supreme court today decided the Kentucky governorship in favor of Governor Beckham, dismissing the writ of error from the Kentucky court of appeals.

The opinion was handed down by Chief Justice Fuller. It stated that the case was dismissed for want of jurisdiction for the reason that contests for state officers must necessarily be settled by the political branch of the government. That branch had acted in

At that time the three delegates appeared. They were unaccompanied and were shown at once into the diplomatic room. Secretary Hay, accompanied by Mr. Babcock, his private secretary and stenographer, entered the diplomatic room and cordially greeted his visitors.

Just what passed between them probably will never be exactly known, for when the meeting was over, after lasting an hour, the Boers in departing stated to a number of anxious newspaper men that they had, and would have, nothing to say as to what happened.

Hay Sees McKinley First.

The secretary of state was more communicative, but before making any statement, made his way to the White House and consulted the president.

The following statement was made by the secretary:

"Messrs. A. Fischer, C. Wessels and Mr. A. D. Wolmarsh, the delegates in this country of the South African republics, called today by appointment at the state department. They were cordially received and remained with the secretary of state for more than an hour. They laid before the secretary at much length and with great energy and eloquence the status of the controversy in South Africa, and the desire of the Boer republic that the United States should intervene in the interest of peace and use its efforts to that end with the British government."

Will Maintain Neutrality.

The secretary of state made the following reply:

"The president, in his message to congress last December said: 'This government has maintained a strict attitude of neutrality in the unfortunate contest between Great Britain and the Boer states of Africa. We have remained faithful to the precept of avoiding entangling alliances as to affairs not of our direct concern. Had circumstances suggested that the parties to the quarrel would have welcomed an expression of the sympathy of the American people that the war might be averted, good offices would have been gladly tendered.'"

The president at once directed me to convey the substance of the telegram to the British government, and in communicating this request I was directed by him to express his earnest hope that a way to bring about peace might be found, and to say that they would be glad to aid in any friendly manner to promote so happy a result. The Transvaal government was at the same time informed of the president's action in the matter."

Our representative in London promptly communicated the president's instruction to Lord Salisbury. In answer was requested to thank the president for the friendly interest shown by him and Lord Salisbury added that her majesty's government would accept the action of the president of any power. This communication also was immediately transmitted to our consul at Pretoria, to be communicated to the president of the South African republic. So far as we are informed the United States was the only government in the world of all those approached by the South African republic which tendered its good offices to either of the combatants in the interest of cessation of hostilities."

Quoted Hague Agreement.

"As allusion has been made to The Hague conference, and as action had been suggested based upon that instrument, it may be as well to quote a phrase from article 3, which states: 'Powers stranger to the dispute may have the right to offer good offices or mediation even during the course of hostilities,' and article 5, which says: 'The functions of the mediator are at an end when once it is declared, either

SECRETARY HAY TURNS
DOWN BOER ENVOYS

Tells Them This Government Will Not Try to Stop the South African War.

Recites Previous Attempt at Mediation and Says That It Will Not Be Repeated.

Washington, May 21.—The state department has met the issue raised by the coming to Washington of the Boer delegation, by declining to interfere in the present struggle. In view of this announced decision all questions as to the character of the recognition to be extended to the delegates and the sufficiency of their credentials dropped at once into the background. It was, after all, of little moment whether or not the Boers were received as diplomatic agents or ministers, so long as they were powerless to promote the prime object of their mission, namely, to cause the United States government to intervene in the present struggle.

The meeting between the delegates and Secretary Hay was brought about in the simplest manner. General O'Brien had secured from the department Saturday a promise to entertain any credentials that might be presented today. This morning a note came to the state department from the delegates asking that they be permitted to present their credentials at the department. A prompt acquiescence was given by Secretary Hay and the hour of 2:30 was fixed for the meeting.

At that time the three delegates appeared. They were unaccompanied and were shown at once into the diplomatic room. Secretary Hay, accompanied by Mr. Babcock, his private secretary and stenographer, entered the diplomatic room and cordially greeted his visitors.

Just what passed between them probably will never be exactly known, for when the meeting was over, after lasting an hour, the Boers in departing stated to a number of anxious newspaper men that they had, and would have, nothing to say as to what happened.

Hay Sees McKinley First. The secretary of state was more communicative, but before making any statement, made his way to the White House and consulted the president. The following statement was made by the secretary:

"Messrs. A. Fischer, C. Wessels and Mr. A. D. Wolmarsh, the delegates in this country of the South African republics, called today by appointment at the state department. They were cordially received and remained with the secretary of state for more than an hour. They laid before the secretary at much length and with great energy and eloquence the status of the controversy in South Africa, and the desire of the Boer republic that the United States should intervene in the interest of peace and use its efforts to that end with the British government."

Will Maintain Neutrality.

The secretary of state made the following reply:

"The president, in his message to congress last December said: 'This government has maintained a strict attitude of neutrality in the unfortunate contest between Great Britain and the Boer states of Africa. We have remained faithful to the precept of avoiding entangling alliances as to affairs not of our direct concern. Had circumstances suggested that the parties to the quarrel would have welcomed an expression of the sympathy of the American people that the war might be averted, good offices would have been gladly tendered.'"

The president at once directed me to convey the substance of the telegram to the British government, and in communicating this request I was directed by him to express his earnest hope that a way to bring about peace might be found, and to say that they would be glad to aid in any friendly manner to promote so happy a result. The Transvaal government was at the same time informed of the president's action in the matter."

Our representative in London promptly communicated the president's instruction to Lord Salisbury. In answer was requested to thank the president for the friendly interest shown by him and Lord Salisbury added that her majesty's government would accept the action of the president of any power. This communication also was immediately transmitted to our consul at Pretoria, to be communicated to the president of the South African republic. So far as we are informed the United States was the only government in the world of all those approached by the South African republic which tendered its good offices to either of the combatants in the interest of cessation of hostilities."

Quoted Hague Agreement.

"As allusion has been made to The Hague conference, and as action had been suggested based upon that instrument, it may be as well to quote a phrase from article 3, which states: 'Powers stranger to the dispute may have the right to offer good offices or mediation even during the course of hostilities,' and article 5, which says: 'The functions of the mediator are at an end when once it is declared, either

by one of the parties to the dispute or by the mediator himself, that the means of reconciliation proposed by him are not accepted.' This would seem to render any further action of the United States inadvisable under existing circumstances."

"The steps taken by the president in his earnest desire to see an end to the strife which has caused so much suffering and bloodshed, and to have gone to the extreme limit permitted to him. Indeed, if in his discretion, he had chosen not to present to England the South African request for good offices, he might have justified his action by referring to the following declaration which was made in the very act of signing The Hague convention by the plenipotentiaries of the United States: 'Nothing contained in this convention shall be construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intervening upon, interfering with, entangling itself with questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign states; nor shall anything contained in said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.'"

Hopes for Close of War.

The president sympathizes heartily in the sincere desire of all the people of the United States that the war which is now afflicting South Africa may, for the sake of both parties engaged, come to a speedy close; but, having done his full duty in preserving a strictly neutral position between them and in seizing the first opportunity that presented itself for tendering his good offices in the interest of peace, he feels that, in the present circumstances, no course is open to him except to persist in the policy of impartial neutrality. To deviate from this would be contrary to all our traditions and all our national interests and would lead to consequences which neither the president nor the people of the United States should regard with favor."

Paucaefote Dispatches O'Brien.

Lord Paucaefote called at the state department while the Boers were consulting with Secretary Hay. He was shown into the diplomatic reception room and there displaced General O'Brien, who also had been waiting to see Secretary Hay.

The Boer representatives will be received by the president of the White House at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. Their visit to the executive mansion was arranged for them by Secretary Hay during their call at the state department this afternoon. The call, it is understood, will be entirely unofficial in character, as the envoys have not yet presented their credentials here.

SENATE AGAINST ENVOYS.

Rejects Motion to Allow Boer Delegates Floor Privileges.

Washington, May 21.—A pyrotechnic discussion of the status of the Boer commissioners now in Washington was precipitated in the senate today by a resolution offered by Mr. Allen (Pop. Neb.), extending to the commissioners the privileges of the floor of the senate during their sojourn in the national capital.

The resolution was defeated by a vote of 36 to 21, but not until after a sharp controversy between its author and Mr. Davis, chairman of the committee on foreign relations. Mr. Allen maintained that the resolution was in line with precedents while Mr. Davis contended that in the particular circumstances the senate ought not to take any action that might be considered a recognition of Boer diplomats until the president, who alone had the power to receive diplomatic representatives, had taken action.

Discussion Is Cut Off.

Mr. Davis said he did not intend to bring in extending to the messengers the war between Great Britain and the South African states and cut off debate by moving to lay the resolution on the table. The motion was agreed to, 36 to 21, as follows:

Years.

Allen, McKenna.

Baker, McMillan.

Burrows, Morgan.

Clark (Wyo.), Nelson.

Davis, Penrose.

Faulkner, Perkins.

Foster, Pettus.

Gallinger, Platt (Conn.).

Gear, Platt (N. Y.).